

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Part I

for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

For reporting on
School Year 2002-2003



DUE DECEMBER 22, 2003

**INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
ROOM 229 STATE HOUSE
INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204-2798**

INTRODUCTION

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Consolidated State Performance Report will consist of two information collections each year. The first part of the Consolidated State Performance Report will be due in December of each year and the second part of the report will be due the following Spring.

This workbook contains Part I of the U.S. Department of Education's Consolidated State Performance Report instrument for State formula grant programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001(NCLB). The workbook contains State reporting requirements for information from the 2002-2003 school year due to the Department by **December 22, 2003**. The Secretary will use this information as part of his first annual report to Congress on the implementation of NCLB.

States may use this format or a format of their choosing to submit the required information. If the information is available through another source, States may refer the Department to that source, e.g., State Report Cards. If a State refers the Department to another source, it must provide specific information on where the data may be accessed, e.g. the URL for the State Report Card.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2002-2003 school year must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report. Reports are due to the Department on **December 22, 2003**, and should reflect data from the 2002-2003 school year.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

To expedite the receipt of this report, please send your report via the Internet as a .doc file, pdf file, rtf or .txt file to conreport@ed.gov, or provide the URL for the site where your submission is posted on the Internet. Please send a follow-up, signed paper copy of "Consolidated State Performance Report Signature Page" via an express courier to the address below.

A State that submits only a paper report should mail the submission by express courier to:

Daisy Greenfield
U.S. Department of Education
Room 3E307
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, DC 20202-6400

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 361 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write directly to Consolidated State Performance Report, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 3E307, Washington, DC 20202-6400.

OMB Number: 1810-0614
Expiration Date: 05/31/2004

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:

Address:

Person to contact about this report:

Name:

Telephone:

Fax:

e-mail:

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):

Signature

Date

I. STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

In the following charts, please provide student achievement data from the 2002-2003 school year test administration. Charts have been provided for each of grades 3 through 8 and high school to accommodate the varied State assessment systems in mathematics and reading/language arts during the 2002-2003 school year. States should provide data on the percentage of students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels for those grades in which the State administered mathematics and reading/language arts assessments during the 2002-2003 school year.

Grade 3 Mathematics	Percent of Students Proficient and Advanced School Year 02-03
All Students	71
American Indian or Alaska Native	66
Asian/Pacific Islander	84
Black or African American	54
Hispanic or Latino	60
White	75
Students with Disabilities	47
Limited English Proficient	56
Economically Disadvantaged	60
Migrant	50
Male	71
Female	71

Grade 3 Reading/Language Arts	Percent of Students Proficient and Advanced School Year 02-03
All Students	74
American Indian or Alaska Native	71
Asian/Pacific Islander	85
Black or African American	54
Hispanic or Latino	58
White	78
Students with Disabilities	44
Limited English Proficient	52
Economically Disadvantaged	61
Migrant	39
Male	71
Female	78

Grade 6 Mathematics	Percent of Students Proficient and Advanced School Year 02-03
All Students	72
American Indian or Alaska Native	66
Asian/Pacific Islander	89
Black or African American	43
Hispanic or Latino	58
White	78
Students with Disabilities	35
Limited English Proficient	56
Economically Disadvantaged	57
Migrant	36
Male	72
Female	73

Grade 6 Reading/Language Arts	Percent of Students Proficient and Advanced School Year 02-03
All Students	69
American Indian or Alaska Native	62
Asian/Pacific Islander	82
Black or African American	45
Hispanic or Latino	53
White	74
Students with Disabilities	27
Limited English Proficient	47
Economically Disadvantaged	53
Migrant	33
Male	64
Female	75

Grade 8 Mathematics	Percent of Students Proficient and Advanced School Year 02-03
All Students	71
American Indian or Alaska Native	59
Asian/Pacific Islander	87
Black or African American	39
Hispanic or Latino	55
White	76
Students with Disabilities	29
Limited English Proficient	51
Economically Disadvantaged	51
Migrant	49
Male	70
Female	71

Grade 8 Reading/Language Arts	Percent of Students Proficient and Advanced School Year 02-03
All Students	65
American Indian or Alaska Native	50
Asian/Pacific Islander	78
Black or African American	38
Hispanic or Latino	47
White	69
Students with Disabilities	20
Limited English Proficient	40
Economically Disadvantaged	45
Migrant	38
Male	60
Female	69

High School Mathematics	Percent of Students Proficient and Advanced School Year 02-03
All Students	67
American Indian or Alaska Native	55
Asian/ Pacific Islander	85
Black or African American	33
Hispanic or Latino	46
White	73
Students with Disabilities	28
Limited English Proficient	41
Economically Disadvantaged	46
Migrant	26
Male	69
Female	66

High School Reading/Language Arts	Percent of Students Proficient and Advanced School Year 02-03
All Students	69
American Indian or Alaska Native	57
Asian/ Pacific Islander	78
Black or African American	40
Hispanic or Latino	44
White	75
Students with Disabilities	23
Limited English Proficient	27
Economically Disadvantaged	48
Migrant	26
Male	65
Female	73

II. SCHOOLS IN NEED OF IMPROVEMENT

- A. In the following chart, please provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under section 1116 for the 2003-2004 school year, based upon data from the 2002-2003 school year. For each school listed, please provide the name of the school's district, the reason(s) for identification (e.g., missing proficiency target, participation rate, other academic indicator), and the school improvement status for the 2003-2004 school year (e.g., school in need of improvement year 1, school in need of improvement year 2, corrective action, restructuring).

**SCHOOLS IDENTIFIED FOR IMPROVEMENT, CORRECTIVE ACTION, AND RESTRUCTURING
[SY 2003-2004]**

District Name & NCES/CCD ID Code	School Name & NCES/CCD ID Code	Reason Identified						School Improvement Status for SY 2003-2004
		Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator		
		Proficiency Target	Participation Rate	Proficiency Target	Participation Rate	Academic Indicator (elementary/ middle schools)	Graduation Rate (high school)	
Fort Wayne CSC 0235	Ben F. Geyer Middle 0117			●		●		1
	Adams Elem 0141					●		2
East Allen County 0255	Southwick Elem 0310	●						1
	Village Elem 0317	●						1
	Meadowbrook Elem 0305	●				●		3
Clarksville CSC 1000	Greenacres Elem 0845	●		●				1
Greater Clark County 1010	Maple Elem 0869	●		●				1
CS of Frankfort 1170	Samuel P. Kyger Elem 1001		●		●			1
	Suncrest Elem 1020	●		●				1
DeKalb Co Ctl United SD 1835	Waterloo Elem 1341	●		●				1
Harrison-Washington CSC 1885	Harrison Elem 1373	●						1
Muncie CS 1970	Grissom Elem 1515	●		●				2
	Washington-Carver Elem 1470	●		●				2
Southwest Dubois Co SC 2110	Huntingburg Elem 1590	●						1
Concord CS 2270	Concord South Side Elem 1725	●		●				1
	Concord West Side Elem 1729	●		●				1
Elkhart CS 2305	Roosevelt Elem 1801	●		●				2
Goshen CS 2315	Chamberlain Elem 1829	●						1

New Albany-Floyd Co CS 2400	Fairmont Elem 1949	•		•				1
	S. Ellen Jones Elem 1981	•		•				2
Franklin Co CSC 2475	Brookville Elem 2125	•		•		•		2
Madison-Grant United SC 2825	Park Elem 2329	•		•				2
Mississinewa CSC 2855	R. J. Baskett Middle 2335	•						2
Marion C S 2865	Southeast Elem 2413	•		•				1
	Frances Slocum Elem 2409	•		•		•		2
New Castle CSC 3445	Eastwood Elem 2832	•		•		•		1
Seymour CS 3675	Seymour-Redding Elem 3157		•		•			1
Jennings Co S	North Vernon Elem 3397			•				1
Vincennes CSC 4335	George Rogers Clark 3557	•		•		•		2
Warsaw CS 4415	Jefferson Elem 3661		•		•			1
Tippecanoe Valley SC 4445	Mentone Elem 3603	•		•				1
Gary CSC 4690	Ivanhoe Elem 4101	•	•	•	•	•		1
	John H. Vohr Elem 4157	•		•		•		1
	Daniel Webster Elem 4165		•	•	•			1
	Theodore Roosevelt High 4033	•	•	•	•	•		2
	Tolleston Middle 4037	•		•		•		2
	Brunswick Elem 4065	•		•		•		2
	David O. Duncan Elem 4086	•	•	•	•	•		2
	Bailly Middle 4103	•	•	•	•	•		2
	Alfred Beckman Middle 4107	•	•	•	•	•		2
	Kuny Elem 4109			•		•		2
	Dunbar-Pulaski Middle 4145	•		•		•		2
	Pyle-Washington 4149			•		•		2
	Westside High 4163	•	•	•	•		•	2
	Lew Wallace High 4029		•		•		•	2

	Horace Mann 4025	•	•	•	•		•	3
	Aetna Elem 4045	•		•		•		3
	Beveridge Elem 4061	•		•		•		3
	Geo. Washington Carver 4069	•		•		•		3
	Charles R. Drew Elem 4081	•						3
	Benjamin Franklin 4089	•		•				3
	Alain L. Locke Elem 4117	•		•		•		3
	Arthur P. Melton Elem 4125	•		•		•		3
	J. Whitcomb Riley Elem 4153	•		•		•		3
Griffith Public S 4700	Eldon Ready Elem 4185	•		•				2
School City of Hammond 4710	Woodrow Wilson Elem 4483	•		•				2
	Lee L. Caldwell Elem 4441			•		•		3
	Lafayette Elem 4461	•		•				3
Whiting School City 4760	Nathan Hale Elem 4361	•		•				2
Anderson CSC 5275	Robinson Elem 5123	•	•	•	•	•		1
Elwood CSC 5280	Oakland Elem 5161	•		•				1
MSD Decatur Twp. 5300	Lynwood Elem 5183	•		•				1
MSD Lawrence Twp. 5330	Harrison Hill Elem 5289	•		•				1
MSD Perry Twp. 5340	Clinton Young Elem 5325	•		•		•		1
	Winchester Village Elem 5351	•		•		•		1
MSD Pike Twp. 5350	Eastbrook Elem 5359	•		•		•		1
MSD Wayne Twp. 5375	Rhoades Elem 5261	•		•				2
	Stout Field Elem 5270	•		•				2
Indianapolis Public Schools 5385	Florence Fay Elem 5521	•				•		1
	Floro Torrence Elem 5583	•						1
	Booth Tarkington Elem 5592			•		•		1
	Frederick Douglass MS 5519	•	•	•	•			2

	Riverside Elem 5544			•		•		2
	Henry Longfellow MS 5528	•	•	•	•	•		3
	Julian D. Coleman MS 5610	•		•				3
North Miami CS 5620	North Miami Elem 6051	•		•				1
Richland-Bean Blossom CS 5705	Stinesville Elem 6117	•		•				1
Monroe County CSC 5740	Highland Park Elem 6162	•		•				1
West Noble SC 6065	West Noble Elem 6510	•		•				1
Spencer-Owen CS 6195	Spencer Elem 6617	•		•				2
Portage Township Schools 6550	Paul Saylor Elem 6876	•		•				1
Jac-Cen-Del CSC 6900	Jac-Cen-Del Elem 7203	•		•				1
South Bend CSC 7205	Benjamin Harrison Elem 7545	•		•		•		1
	Henry Studebaker Elem 7617	•	•		•	•		2
	Marquette Primary 7577	•		•				3
Scott County Sch Dist. 1 7230	Austin Elem 7630	•		•				1
North Judson-San Pierre CS 7515	Liberty Elem 7851	•		•		•		3
Southeast SC 7715	Carlisle Elem & Jr. High 7953	•		•		•		1
	Sullivan Elem 7965	•				•		1
Evansville-Vanderburgh SC 7995	Lincoln Elem 8251	•		•				1
	John M. Culver Elem 8281	•		•		•		2
	Delaware Elem 8285	•		•				2
	Evans Middle 8291	•		•		•		3
	Glenwood Middle 8301	•		•		•		3
	Harwood Middle 8313	•		•		•		3
Western Wayne Schools 8355	Western Wayne Elem 8971	•		•		•		1
Twin Lakes SC 8565	Eastlawn Elem 9129	•		•				1

B. Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring.

2003-2004 TITLE I STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF SUPPORT *Initiatives for School Support and Improvement*

In 2003-2004, the Title I Statewide System of Support services are provided by multiple outside school improvement consulting partnerships and/or providers. These credentialed education specialists have extensive knowledge of scientifically-based research, the Title I law, and school reform. This support team has intense work experience with the SEA, local education agencies [LEAs], institutions, and/or school staff in planning and implementing Title I schoolwide programs. In addition, these providers/consultants have demonstrated success in team building and facilitating school reform/improvement initiatives in Indiana, regionally, and nationally.

Design of Activities: Highlights of these initiatives funded through SEA school improvement funds and SEA administrative funds for the 2003-2004 program year are provided below.

Schoolwide Model Support System

I. Statewide Support System for Planning Schools (Schoolwide)

This school support system provides services to schools eligible for schoolwide planning and participating in Year 1 Planning. This system of support includes five key components.

- (A) A schoolwide program planning (SWP) **overview meeting** is held during the spring for representatives from all districts and buildings eligible for Title I SWP. Eligibility for SWP participation is based on a poverty level equal to or greater than 40 percent and the decision of the school staff to participate in the state's schoolwide planning process.
- (B) Schoolwide program (SWP) **planning team meetings** are held four times during the school year in Indianapolis. Each participating school sends a team of six to eight members, consisting of the following: principal, Title I program administrator or district coordinator, Title I-funded building staff, parents, and building level teachers representing various grades or disciplines. Each team meeting focuses on a specific aspect of the SWP planning process:

July -- Emphasis is on the *comprehensive needs assessment* process (two day workshop). Consultants reinforce the steps and processes for conducting a comprehensive needs assessment, interpreting ISTEP+ test reports, analyzing student performance data, and writing findings. School teams develop specific plans for conducting their SWP needs assessments.

November -- Emphasis is on the *inquiry process* (two day workshop). Schools begin to consider research-based effective practices that have potential for addressing their needs. Consultants reinforce the steps for the inquiry process and model using a number of tools for organizing and sharing a team's inquiry findings.

February -- Emphasis is on completing the *inquiry process* and developing goals and strategies (two day workshop). Participants will share outcomes from initial steps in the inquiry process, develop a process for reviewing current programming related to effective practices and guiding principles identified through inquiry, link effective practices/guiding principles to key findings from the comprehensive needs assessment, learn strategies for developing school-wide goals and strategies, and learn to use tools for reaching consensus and making decisions.

April -- Emphasis is on *finalizing and operationalizing the draft SWP plan*.

Participants share draft goals and strategies, discuss systems for monitoring student performance, and plan for implementation on an ongoing basis. Consultants introduce frameworks for formative assessment and professional development.

(C) Four schoolwide program planning (SWP) **networking seminars** are held in July/August, October/November, January and April. Administrators from schools and districts operating successful SWPs are featured presenters at each leadership seminar. Each seminar highlights Qs & As with these practitioners and focuses on issues and conditions facing high poverty schools as well as strategies that administrators can use to facilitate the SWP planning process and strengthen team building efforts.

(D) Five **on-site technical assistance visits** are held at each participating school: one visit between August and September; one visit between September and October; one visit between December and January, one visit between February through March, and one visit in May (some schools receive an additional visit if necessary during this period). All schools receive four full-day on-sites that include strategies for coaching, mentoring and demonstrations. The technical assistance team meets with the SWP planning team and district staff to respond to their unique needs and monitor the planning process. The foci for the five visits are:

- supporting the comprehensive needs assessment process, analyzing student performance data (e.g. strengths/weaknesses related to State standards), using school mission/vision to identify local priorities, and developing plans for completing the comprehensive needs assessment;
- monitoring the inquiry process, using information and findings from the needs assessment, and moving from the exploration to the focus stage of inquiry;
- developing drafts of SWP goals and strategies, monitoring team building and ownership, and overseeing the needs-based decision-making process; and
- reviewing the SWP draft plan and providing assistance in drafting action plans to finalize and operationalize the SWP plan, with a focus on performance assessment and professional development components.

(E) A **notebook system** is used to document and support the planning process. One notebook holds planning resources and tools, (e.g., key research, professional journal articles, government reports, legal requirements, forms, and advanced organizers). A second notebook is used for organizing and revising sections of the developing SWP plan throughout the year.

II. Statewide Support System for Year 1 Implementing Schools (SWP) This school support system provides services to schoolwides after their year of planning and in Year 1 Implementing of their improvement plan. These SWPs were involved in the 2002-2003 School Support System for Indiana. After one year of planning for schoolwide, these schools

receive continued school support during their first year of implementing their schoolwide plan. Schools implementing schoolwide plans receive two 1-day group meetings during the year, and each school receives three full-day on-site technical assistance visits. During the team meetings, the consultants assist the school teams in conducting an ongoing process for monitoring SWP plan implementation and the impact on student achievement. Teams also receive opportunities to share information with one another. Team meetings focus on data collection tools/process, analysis of qualitative and quantitative data, use of rubrics, formative and summative assessment processes. Emphasis is also on writing, early child/observation-based assessment and performance-based assessments. Consultants facilitate checkpoints and staff meetings on site, modeling use of KWLs process (What I Know, What I Want to Know, What I Learned) to analyze data and report to staff.

III. Statewide Support System for Year 2 Implementing Schools (SWP)

This school support system provides services to schoolwides in Year 2 Implementing. These SWPs were involved in the School Support System for Indiana as planning schools and Year 1 Implementing schools. Consultants will conduct two 1-day group meetings during the year. Each Year 2 Implementing school will receive two full-day on-site technical assistance visits.

On-site technical assistance visits are made to each participating school. Consultants assist teams in auditing the SWP implementation monitoring process. This process includes reviewing and revising data collection, summarizing data, analyzing practices, and setting/strengthening SWP benchmarks. While on site, consultants facilitate checkpoints and staff meetings, modeling the use of KWLs to analyze data and report to staff. Consultants provide orientation to SWP for new Title I administrators and building principals at a group meeting in the late summer and ongoing networking through meeting/distance learning two additional times during the year (December and April). Videotapes of distance learning seminars conducted with model sites for the SWP planning schools are made available to the implementing schools/districts and administrators. Consultants coordinate technical assistance with the state's education accountability plan to ensure that respective 2003-2004 school plans are aligned with SWP, P.L. 221, and CSRD requirements.

IV. Statewide Support System for Year 3-7 (SWP)

This school support system provides services to SWPs in Years 3-7 Implementing. These SWPs were involved in the School Support System for Indiana during their Planning Year and Years 1 and 2 Implementing Years. The sustaining years (Years 3-7 Implementing) support the refinement of the school improvement processes and assist in reallocation of resources and organizational frameworks to maintain sustainability. That is, schools have developed the capacity to support continuous, ongoing school improvement. Consultants will conduct two full-day technical assistance visits for Year 3 Implementing schools. Year 3 through 7 Implementing schools may use Title I funds or other funds for site technical assistance visits.

On-site technical assistance visits are made to Year 3 Implementing schools. For all on-site technical assistance visits, consultants assist teams in auditing the SWP implementation monitoring process. This process includes reviewing and revising data collection, summarizing data, and analyzing practices, and setting/strengthening SWP benchmarks. Consultants facilitate checkpoints and staff meetings on site and model the use of KWLs to analyze and report data to staff. Consultants provide orientation to SWP for new Title I administrators and building principals at a group meeting in the late summer. In addition the consultants provide ongoing networking through meetings or distance learning two additional times during the year (October and March). Videotapes of the distance learning seminars conducted with model

sites for the SWP planning schools are made available to Implementing schools and district administrators. Consultants coordinate technical assistance with the state's education accountability system, so the respective school plans meet both SWP, P.L. 221, state education accountability and CSRD requirements.

Targeted Assistance Schools Model Support System

I. School Support for Targeted Assistance School(s) (Planning)

This school support system provides services to Title I schools with less than 40% poverty and in need of improvement. These schools are supported in Year 1 of Continuous School Improvement and planning for P.L. 221. The system of support aligns with the state education accountability system and includes the following assistance.

- (A) Title I school **planning team meetings** are held four times during the school year. Each participating school sends a team of 6-8 members, consisting of the following: principal, Title I program administrator or district coordinator, Title I-funded building staff, parents, and building level teachers representing various grades or disciplines. Each team meeting focuses on a specific aspect of the planning process.
- (B) Five **on-site technical assistance visits** are held at each participating school: one visit between August and September; one visit between September and October; one visit between November and December; one visit between February and March, and one visit between April and May. Targeted assistance schools not demonstrating adequate progress may receive technical assistance visits 1-2 times during the summer. A consultant from the technical assistance team meets with the TAS planning team and district staff to respond to their unique needs and monitor the planning process.

II. TAS Support for Year 1 Implementing Schools

This school support system provides services to Title I schools that participated in Year 1 Planning and are in Year 1 Implementing. These schools were involved in the 2002-2003 pilot for TAS support. After one year of planning during their state education accountability year, these schools receive continued school support during their first year of implementing their effectiveness plan. Teams implementing plans participate in two 2-day workshops (Sept./Oct. and March). During the workshops, the consultants assist school teams in conducting an ongoing process for monitoring implementation of the plan for continuous improvement, monitoring student performance-based assessments, aligning instruction to the Indiana academic standards, and modeling best practices. An on-site visit per school follows each workshop to facilitate impact and implementation assessment designs. Two on-site technical assistance visits occur during Implementing Year 1.

III. TAS Support for Year 2 Implementing Schools

This school support system provides services to schools in Year 2 Implementing. These schools were involved in the 2002-2003 pilot for TAS Support Year 1 Implementing. After one year of planning during their state education accountability year, these schools receive continued school support during their first and second year of implementing their effectiveness plan. Teams receiving support during their second year of implementing plans receive two on-site technical assistance visits. During the on-site, the consultants assist the school teams in conducting an ongoing process for monitoring implementation of the plan for continuous improvement, monitoring student performance-based assessments, aligning instruction to the Indiana academic standards, operationalizing their action plan in a second and/or third key content area for a comprehensive, cohesive, and continuous school improvement process.

SEA Facilities and Delinquent Institution Support System

Intensive Support for State Agency Facilities and Delinquent Institution(s)

The process used for schoolwide and the TAS pilot schools is also the design used for institution-wide planning for Holy Cross School and Southwest Indiana Regional Youth Village. This support, provided by Dynamic Transitions, includes the following strategies,

- A comprehensive needs assessment of the educational needs of all youth in the institution,
- A description of the process taken to design the school plan (the infrastructure for interactive participation and team building),
- The development of goals and strategies for meeting the needs of students,
- A professional development plan that supports teachers' ongoing professional learning,
- A description of the instructional program used to meet the needs of all students,
- An assessment plan that describes how student progress is regularly and consistently measured and how the plan will be monitored for implementation.

The technical assistance for 2003-2004 aligns the school's plan with standards and accountability as required under P.L. 221. Technical assistance includes:

- Two to three monthly on-site technical assistance visits,
- Team-building opportunities for the development of a coherent planning team,
- A comprehensive assessment of the correctional facilities,
- Creation of a committee structure based on the findings of the study,
- Establishment of a decision-making model based on consensus,
- Assistance in developing a vision statement to guide the school improvement process,
- The latest research related to the education of juvenile populations,
- A coordinated professional development plan for the entire staff at the correctional school to enable teachers and personnel to carry out the institution-wide plan effectively,
- Leadership support to assist the correctional school in implementing and monitoring the progress of the institution-wide plan.

Comprehensive School Reform Support System

The Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) project provides technical assistance to 28 CSRD schools. This technical assistance focuses on support for implementing the core components of their CSRD designs and includes curriculum and instructional practices, parent and community involvement, the creation of a supportive school and district environment. In addition, schools receive technical assistance (a 2-day session in fall and a 1-day session in spring) to monitor checkpoints for impact on student achievement and implementation of the plan across the CSRD school. The assistance includes data analysis for student performance, implementation of research-based strategies, and continuous job-embedded professional development. This technical assistance aligns with the support provided to schools identified for school improvement and eligible for Reading First so that high poverty schools in need of improvement will have available to them the resources and technical assistance necessary for continuous improvement.

TOPHAT II Consortium (MCREL Initiative)

Teaching Optimization Producing Higher Achievement Trends (TOPHAT II Consortium)

The TOPHAT II Consortium is new to the Division of Compensatory Education, but is not new to the Indiana Department of Education. TOPHAT I has been servicing a consortium of small, mostly rural districts for the past three years with remarkable success. For 2003-2004, the Division of Compensatory Education formed a partnership with the Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning lab (MCREL) to work with schools identified for school improvement. The Indiana Department of Education invited two hundred eight schools that were in school improvement status for 2002-2003. Thirty-four schools attended the awareness meeting for TOPHAT. Twenty-one schools applied to be part of this new consortium.

The TOPHAT II consortium is comprised of 21 low-performing, fiscally poor schools in Indiana that will work with the Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning lab and the Indiana Department of Education to improve student achievement. The organizational structures that support the consortium are:

- Consortium Planning Sessions
- Mentor Training Sessions
- Site Visits
- Leadership Team Training Sessions
- Building Level Leaders Training Sessions
- Coaches Training Sessions
- On-site Training Sessions
- After-action Reviews
- Website

At the beginning of the year, administrators and mentors meet with MCREL staffers to determine the needs of the consortium members and to plan the Leadership Training sessions and site visits for the upcoming year. The mentors are outside state sponsored consultants and internal Indiana Department of Education Title I consultants who are assigned specific schools. While the Indiana Department of Education is the convening agency for this process, MCREL delivers the content.

The **MCREL Leadership Training** sessions meet three times per year (6 days total). The District Leadership Team consists of teachers, administrators, board members, principals, and the Title I program administrator. These sessions take place in the autumn, spring, and summer of the school year. Team meeting time is provided to process what teams have learned and to plan how to disseminate and implement the content in their schools.

The **MCREL Mentor Training** sessions occur three times per year. Mentors meet with MCREL staffers before and after the formal training sessions to discuss the progress their sites are making and to address current issues and concerns. Before the Leadership Training sessions, mentors are provided an overview of the content for the upcoming training. In addition, the external mentors and Title I consultants meet with MCREL and the administrators prior to the school year to plan the Leadership Training sessions. These mentors provide technical assistance with at least six on-site visits.

Site Visits by MCREL Consultants are scheduled two times per year. The MCREL staffers will visit building sites to reinforce their efforts and to specifically address issues related to the implementation of standards-based practices. The external mentors and IDOE staff consultants conduct six (6) onsite visits to each school.

Indiana Student Achievement Institute (INSAI)

The Indiana Department of Education and the Indiana Student Achievement Institute (INSAI) have formed a consortium serving low-performing schools. Priority is given to schools identified as in need of improvement during the 2002-2003 school year. The purpose is to raise student achievement in Indiana's schools through a whole school reform process. The mission of INSAI is to enable school-community teams to establish a local culture which promotes high expectations, sound guidance, effective teaching, a supportive environment, and, as a result, high student achievement.

Teams of six (administrator, counselor, two teachers, parent, and business representative) attend ten INSAI sessions over a two-year period (Six sessions in the first year). Between sessions, teams complete tasks with the entire faculty, student body, and representatives of community stakeholder groups. Teams are supported by substantial technical assistance.

The process is vision-based, data-driven (using disaggregated data), and includes a local analysis of seventeen force fields that influence achievement. High-leverage strategies are implemented within targeted force fields. Each strategy is supported by a strategy plan, a resistance plan, a professional development plan, and an evaluation plan.

Other State Support System Components

A. Fall Administrative Workshops

Title I Fall Administrative Workshops are conducted across the state in 6 regional locations. Title I program administrators and principals who have Title I programs in their schools receive information on focus topics such as reauthorization; focusing professional development on priority needs; providing an infrastructure for ongoing, job-embedded professional development; aligning NCLB with Title I/School improvement Plans; and developing goals and strategies on key principles and research-based practices. The focus of the 2003 Fall Administrative Workshops was scientifically-based research/evidence-based research.

B. Spring Workshops --- Consolidated Application Process

Six regional workshops will be held throughout the state. The spring workshops provide updates to NCLB and technical assistance for the Title I application.

C. Ongoing Regional Networking Support

This component of the Title I school support system is a collaborative venture with local Title I program administrators. Seven Title I regions conduct regular networking meetings. Regions conduct at least three to four meetings throughout the year. Each regional networking site has representatives who are members of the Committee of Practitioners. Title I program administrators and coordinators share program information and best practices, and discuss information that has been presented at Practitioner meetings. SEA staff attend meetings to clarify information and answer questions (e.g. AYP; school improvement planning; comprehensive needs assessment). The networking structure provides opportunities for SEA follow-up and support in key component areas.

D. New Program Administrator's Workshop Series

This new workshop series is especially designed for individuals who have recently assumed responsibilities as administrators for Title I programs. This series will include the following:

- Vocabulary unique to Title I
- Legal requirements of Title I
- Local reports/information
- Amendment process
- Important fiscal issues
- Process for aligning Title I plans/school improvement plans to NCLB

E. New Horizons for School Programs and Services:

This initiative is based on work conducted by the Comprehensive Center Region VII, USDE with Oklahoma City Public Schools. This project assists school and district planning teams to align school improvement plans to NCLB. The approach to program development and monitoring is based on the "logic model." New Horizons takes planning teams through a process that results in a high-quality school improvement plan aligned with *No Child Left Behind*. The process allows schools/districts to be flexible in strategies/processes/programs/approaches to improving student achievement, while at the same time making them more accountable for what they plan and implement.

SUMMARY

During the 2003-2004 school year, Title I School Improvement Funds and the Division of Compensatory Education's technical assistance will benefit approximately 205 Title I schools from over 101 districts; two facilities for neglected and/or delinquent children; and seven Regional Networking sites

III. PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE AND SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

A. Public School Choice

1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring from which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2002-2003 school year. 149 120.

2. Please provide the number of public schools to which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2002-2003 school year. 148 132.

3. Please provide the number of students who transferred to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2002-2003 school year. 934 1,301.

B. Supplemental Educational Services

1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2002-2003 school year. 38 39.

2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2002-2003 school year. 3825 1,212.

Responses to Section III choice and SES questions were **amended** by the Indiana Department of Education as of February 5, 2004.

IV. HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS

In the September 1, 2003, Consolidated State Application submission, States provided information on the percentage of classes in core academic subjects taught by “highly qualified” teachers in the aggregate and in “high-poverty” schools. For the 2002-2003 school year, please now also provide the percentage of classes in the core academic subjects taught by “highly qualified” teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA) in “low-poverty” schools. (Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines “low poverty” as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State).

Percentage of classes in core academic subjects taught by “highly qualified” teachers in “low-poverty” schools during the 2002-2003 school year. 97.0